Attachment 1

UNITED STATE DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO EASTERN DIVISION

) CASE NO.
Plaintiff(s),)) JUDGE BRIDGET M. BRENNAN)
v. Defendant(s).)) REPORT OF PARTIES' PLANNING) MEETING UNDER FED. R. CIV. P. 26(f) AND L.R. 16.3(b)(3))
Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(f) and	Local Rule 16.3(b)(3), a meeting was held on
, and was attended by:	
counsel fo	or plaintiff(s)
counsel fo	or defendant(s)
1. The parties:	
will exchange the pre-discove	ery disclosures required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(a)(1)
no later than five (5) business days be	efore the Case Management Conference per the
Court's Notice of Case Management	Conference and Order.
-or -	
have not been required to ma	ke initial disclosures pursuant to Rule 26(a)(1)(B)
because this matter falls into the exce	epted category of

2.	The parties recommend the following case designation:
	Expedited
	Standard
	Complex
	Administrative
	Mass Tort
	Pursuant to Local Rule 16.2(b), if the recommended track designation is
	expedited, standard, or complex, the factors supporting such recommendation are
3.	The parties have discussed whether this case is suitable for one or more of the following
	Alternative Dispute Resolution ("ADR") mechanisms and inform the Court of their
	position as to the following options:
	Early Neutral Evaluation
	Mediation
	Arbitration
	Summary Jury Trial
	Summary Bench Trial
	Case not suitable for ADR
	Case not suitable for ADR now, but may be after discovery
4.	The parties [do/do not] consent to the jurisdiction of the United States Magistrate Judge
	pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(c).

Case: 1:23-cv-00104-BMB Doc #: 6-1 Filed: 02/16/23 3 of 5. PageID #: 65

5.	With respect t	to electronically stored information, the parties: [choose one]
		agree to follow the default standard for discovery of electronically stored
		information (Appendix K to Northern District of Ohio Local Rules).
	- or -	
		will finalize an alternative agreement that sets out retention guidelines,
		search methodology, the format for production, and procedures for
		addressing attorney-work product or privileged information by
		·
6.	The parties ha	ave discussed whether the Court should enter a protective order to facilitate
	discovery and	state as follows: [choose one]
		agreed to the form protective order set forth in Appendix L to the Local
		Rules and will submit the proposed order to the Court no later than
	- or -	
		will submit an alternative proposed protective order for the Court's
		consideration. Said proposed protective order will be submitted to the
		Court no later than with an addendum setting forth the
		differences between the parties' proposed protective order and Appendix
		L to the Local Rules.
	- or -	
		disagree as to the necessity of a protective order.
	- or -	
		agree that a protective order is not necessary at this time.

7.	Recommended Discovery Plan:			
	a.	Describe the subjects on which discovery is to be sought and the nature and extent		
		of discovery:		
	b.	State any discovery disputes or challenges anticipated by either party:		
8.	Recom	nmended discovery cut-off date:		
9.	Recom	nmended cut-off date for amending the pleadings/and or adding additional parties:		
		·		
10	Expert	Discovery. Expert Discovery [does/does not] need to be concluded prior to the		
	submis	ssion of dispositive motions.		
		Expert report(s) for party with the burden of proof:		
		Responsive expert report(s) due:		
		Expert discovery deadline:		
11	Recom	nmended dispositive motion deadline:		
12	Recon	nmended date for status conference:		

Case: 1:23-cv-00104-BMB Doc #: 6-1 Filed: 02/16/23 5 of 5. PageID #: 67

	0. 71 : ::00()	
	Attorney for Plaintiff(s)	
	Attorney for Defendant(s)	